## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

8

9

11 MARVIN JOHNSON, 12 Plaintiff(s), No. C06-4217 MMC (BZ) 13 BRIEFING ORDER v. 14 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al., 15 Defendant(s).

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

On May 31, 2007, I held a telephonic conference to discuss plaintiff's May 24, 2007 motions to shorten time and to extend time to complete discovery. All parties participated through counsel. In light of the discussion on the record, IT IS ORDERED as follows:

- 22
- 1. Defendants having no opposition to plaintiff's May 24, 2007 motion to shorten time, that motion is **GRANTED**;
- 23
- The parties shall meet and confer in an effort to
- 24 25
- resolve this dispute, having in mind the views expressed by
- 26

27

the court.

3. If they cannot resolve the dispute, defendants'

opposition shall be filed by June 8, 2007;

28

1	4. Plaintiff's reply, if any, shall be filed by June 12
2	2007;
3	5. Defendants' disclosures, pursuant to Federal Rule of
4	Civil Procedure 26(a), shall be made by June 8, 2007. The
5	parties are reminded that a failure to voluntarily disclose
6	information pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)
7	or to supplement disclosures or discovery responses pursuant
8	to Rule 26(e) may result in exclusionary sanctions.
9	6. If a hearing is necessary, the court will schedule
10	one.
11	Dated: May 31, 2007
12	Bernard Zimmerman
13	United States Magistrate Judge
14	G:\BZALL\-REFS\Johnson v. SF\order.briefing.schedule.wpd
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	